

Gertz, Jan C., Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid, eds. *The Formation of the Pentateuch*. FAT 111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016. xi + 1204 pp. Hardcover. EUR 269.00.

*The Formation of the Pentateuch* developed in stages, first with an international long-standing research group meeting at the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies in Jerusalem, 2012–2013, followed by two major international conferences in 2013 and 2014 at the same location. With key scholars in the field involved in the project, the interest has been significant. The volume contains ten parts, with a total of fifty-six essays by forty-nine scholars. Unquestionably, it will remain a standard reference for years to come for those interested in the question of the Pentateuch's formation.

Julius Wellhausen's New Documentary Hypothesis has been the standard theory within Pentateuchal studies since the end of the nineteenth century, and the subject of much debate. It still enjoys a significant number of followers. For some, it appears to constitute a default theory, even with its weaknesses, because no better explanation has been offered. Others treat it with indifference, as their research interests take them in different directions, and some reject it altogether.

The editors of *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, however, point to an even more severe challenge to the field than the debate over the Documentary Hypothesis, namely "the fragmentation of discourse altogether as scholarly communities in the three main research centers of Israel, Europe, and North America increasingly talk past one another" (2). The aim of the volume is to encourage the "move toward a set of shared assumptions and a common discourse" (4).

A relevant question, therefore, is whether the volume succeeds in establishing a set of shared assumptions and a common discourse. Reading through the papers, it is clear that there is still significant divergence in the field. It is also unclear whether the individual authors themselves have moved noticeably in their positions toward a convergence. Nevertheless, the organizers of the conferences and editors of the volume should be credited for the results already achieved. Bringing scholars together from different camps, both in the conference and the volume, is a contribution itself to an ongoing discourse. In my opinion, where the volume appears most successful is in exposing and clarifying the divergent and disparate voices in the field of Pentateuchal studies. Sometimes clarification of differences is a first necessary step in creating a meaningful dialogue.

The introductions to each of the ten parts of the volume provide brief and helpful highlights regarding some of the major issues and tendencies within each subfield of the Pentateuch's formation. These introductions provide a helpful tool for gaining easy access to basic trends in fields of Pentateuchal research that one might not be familiar with.

A review should primarily focus on what is in the book, rather than what is left out. Still, one wonders what the criteria were for selecting certain scholars to contribute and leaving others out. It is not stated. Looking through the

Table of Contents, one quickly notices that several names are missing. I imagine there might be mundane reasons why some key players in the discussion are left out, like scheduling conflicts and workload. One can only encourage an increasing openness and inclusiveness in the discourse on the formation of the Pentateuch, since the text still seems to hide many of its secrets from our modern eye.

In the second part of this review, I would like to briefly reflect on three of the papers. These are selected given the limitations on this review, but also because they seem to contain significant points for future research. The first is Jeffrey Stackert's "Pentateuchal Coherence and the Science of Reading" (253–268). He argues that we need to refine how we talk about coherence in regards to the Pentateuch. He claims that we should distinguish between 'cohesion' which "refers to the meaningful connections within language, or, more specifically, the internal semantic linkages between sentence elements" and 'coherence,' "which is properly an achievement of the reader, even as it is highly dependent upon a text's cohesive ties" (254). While cohesion, therefore, should be understood as a phenomenon within the text itself, coherence is a phenomenon created by the reader. This granted, one may ask how we construe coherence in the Pentateuchal texts. While traditional readers have argued that coherence is found on the level of the final form of the text, critical scholars have argued that coherence is achieved by splitting the final form of the text into various internally coherent sources or layers of redaction. However, as Eckart Otto, among others, has pointed out, in its pursuit of coherence, source criticism has become a *recursus ad infinitum*. Even if we split the Pentateuchal text into respective sources, research has amply demonstrated that we are not left with internally coherent texts according to our modern taste. A key question, therefore, is how we should relate our idea of coherence to the Pentateuchal text as we have it? Was literary coherence a prime quest in the compositional logic of biblical authors?

The second essay I would like to mention is Jan Joosten's "Diachronic Linguistics and the Date of the Pentateuch" (327–344). He writes: "A first inference to be drawn from the diachronic framework is that the Pentateuch is to be regarded substantially as preexilic. Ascribing large parts of the Pentateuch to the Persian period, as is done routinely by many OT scholars, is impossible to reconcile with the linguistic data" (336). And again, "the Pentateuch is, from a linguistic point of view, remarkably unified. It is hard to detect developments from book to book or from one stratum to another" (338). Future research on the formation of the Pentateuch needs to take more note of the linguistic evidence. The essays in the volume do point to limitations and weaknesses with diachronic linguistics, and still the evidence provided from this research should be taken more seriously than it has been in the past. This also highlights the need for more interdisciplinary collaboration in the field.

The final essay I reference is Dalit Rom-Shiloni's "Compositional Harmonization—Priestly and Deuteronomistic References in the Book of Jeremiah—An Early Stage of a Recognized Interpretive Technique"

(913–941). This essay reflects the need to take inner-biblical reuse and the relation between Torah and the prophets into consideration when discussing the formation of the Pentateuch. The entrenched debate on the priority of Torah or priority of the prophets demands more rigor and refinement. It appears that the manner in which the biblical authors reused texts has often confused us as modern readers, since it again differs from our literary standards. Rom-Shiloni writes: “Two crucial features of this rhetorical/literary technique within the book of Jeremiah (and prophecy in general) deserve special attention: the thoughtful *intentionality* behind the harmonizations and the prophet’s *freedom* in creating harmonizations in what appear oftentimes to be virtuosic ways. The prophet clearly feels completely free to create these wordplays and thematic combinations purely to suit the context of his prophecy” (938–939). While ancient readers clearly were close readers of earlier compositions, which they saw as authoritative, they took freedoms that can easily be misinterpreted with the wrong assumptions. Therefore, more sensitivity to the unique ways in which biblical authors reused texts seems called for when we discuss the phenomena of repetition with variation within the Pentateuch itself.

In summary, one can applaud and welcome *The Formation of the Pentateuch* for present and future scholarship. The divergence and disparate voices exposed in the volume should make all aware that the field of Pentateuchal research is still in formation. While it is a good summary of the state of research in the field, it simultaneously calls for open and determined research to unlock the secrets of the Pentateuch’s formation, still hidden to our modern eyes. We can conclude, with a reuse of Wittgenstein’s statement, “God grant the [readers of the Pentateuch] insight into what lies in front of everyone’s eyes.” (Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, ed. G. H. Von Wright, trans. Peter Winch [Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1984], 63).

Vesterålen, Norway

KENNETH BERGLAND

Hayes, Elizabeth R., and Karolien Vermeulen, eds. *Doubling and Duplicating in the Book of Genesis: Literary and Stylistic Approaches to the Text*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016. xiv + 209 pp. Hardcover. USD 59.50.

*Doubling and Duplicating* is a collection of essays presented in Vienna, in 2014, at the joint meeting of ISBL and EABS on the stylistics of the book of Genesis. The essays are divided into three parts: First, formal doublets and the whole; second, thematic pairs; and third, doubling plots and duplicating stories.

The multiplicity of approaches characterizes the last several decades of the study of the Hebrew Bible, to the point that many ask whether the future might only contain further scholarly divergence. If it is possible to speak of trends in this period, one trend may be a stronger focus upon literary and synchronic approaches. However, these approaches can be further subdivided between, for example, Genre Criticism, Rhetorical